



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

different electrical combinations, thus varying the speed of the motor without the use of any wasteful resistance. The direction of rotation is also governed by the same switch, so that the operation of the motor is very simple, and it can be put in charge of an ordinary workman.

Any system of conveying the current from the dynamo to the locomotive can be used, either using the rails as one side of the circuit for the return of the current, or else employing a complete metallic circuit by the use of a double overhead trolley wire. In this latter case, a trolley pole, shown in the view, carrying at its upper end two trolley wheels for making running contact with the overhead wires, is attached on the rear of the locomotive car.

This mining locomotive is now being manufactured by the Sprague Electric Railway and Motor Company from designs made by Mr. I. E. Storey. One of the most noticeable advances made in modern mining science is the adoption of electricity as a medium for transmitting power and producing light, and

the same wires which supply current to the drill, and, when in such use, are connected in multiple arc across the main current wires.

These drills are manufactured and sold by the Sprague Electric Railway and Motor Company of New York, under patents granted to Mr. I. E. Storey. We understand that the Sprague Company is now at work on, and will soon be able to furnish, a number of special mining applications, among which is an electric percussion drill.

THE LATEST THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH.¹

WHEN, one is sometimes tempted to ask in sheer weariness, will any man be able to say the last word on that question of the West which bids fair to be as eternal as any question of the East, — the question whether we, the English people, are ourselves or somebody else? That formula is not a new one.



ELECTRIC MINING DRILL.

such applications as the above indicate the growing demand of mining companies for just such apparatus, and the ability of the leading electric companies to supply the need.

ELECTRIC ROTARY DIAMOND DRILL.

THE accompanying view shows a new electric mining rotary drill which has shown good results in experimental work, and which will soon be applied to regular mining-work in several leading mines.

A good electric mining drill has always been desired by miners, and this drill seems to meet all the requirements. It is light, compact, simple, and easy to operate. The motor is completely incased, so that it is impossible for dust, dirt, or stray stones to lodge in the working parts. The whole drill is mounted on an adjustable frame, so that it can be very easily set in any position desired, or set at work at any part of the mine.

The current for operating the drill is supplied at a constant voltage or potential, the number of volts depending on the potential used for transmitting power throughout the mine. If lamps are needed, they can be supplied with current from

Some of us have, in season and out of season, through evil report and good report, been fighting out that question for not a few years. If it is wearisome to have to fight it out still, there is some little relief in having to fight it out in a wholly new shape and with a wholly new set of adversaries. It is an experience which has at least the charm of novelty when we have to argue the old question, who are we, whence we came, from a point of view which might make it possible, with the exercise of a little ingenuity, to avoid ever using the words "Celt," "Briton," or "Roman" at all. On the other hand, the strife in its new form has become more deadly; the assault has become more threatening. Hitherto we have fought for victory, for dominion, for what, if one adopted the high-polite style of a lord mayor's feast, one might call "the imperial instincts of the Anglo-Saxon race." We have had to fight to prove our greatness against people who told us that we were not so great as we thought. Angles and Saxons, we were told, were only one element, perhaps a very inferior element, in the population of Britain. Still nobody denied that we had some place in the world, some place in this island. It might be a very small place compared with that of the Celt who went

¹ From The Contemporary Review for January.

before us, or of the Norman who came after us. Still we had some place. Nobody denied that there had been Angles and Saxons in the isle of Britain. Nobody denied that those Angles and Saxons had had some share in the history of the isle of Britain. Nobody—save, I believe, one thoroughgoing man at Liverpool—denied that those Angles and Saxons had supplied some part, however mean a part, to the tongue now spoken over the larger part of Britain. Nobody, I fancy, ever denied that to the mixed ancestry of the present inhabitants of Britain, Angles and Saxons had contributed some elements, however paltry. The fight seemed hard, and we did not know that there was a harder fight coming. For now the strife is not for victory or dominion, but for life. The question is no longer whether Angles and Saxons have played a greater or a less part in the history of Britain: it now is, whether there ever were any Angles or Saxons in Britain at all, perhaps whether there ever were any Angles or Saxons anywhere; or, more truly, the question takes a form of much greater subtlety. Our new teachers ask us, sometimes seemingly without knowing what they are asking, to believe a doctrine that is strange indeed. The latest doctrine, brought to its real substance, comes to this: we are not Angles and Saxons; we did not come from the land of the Angles and Saxons; we are some other people who came from some other land; only by some strange chance we were led to believe that we were Angles and Saxons, to take the name of Angles and Saxons, and even to speak the tongue which we should have spoken if we had been such. Or, to come back to the old formula with which we began, we are not really ourselves, but somebody else; only at some stage of our life we fell in with ingenious schoolmasters, who cunningly persuaded us that we were ourselves.

On the old controversy I need not enter again now. That controversy might have been much shorter if clever talkers would have taken the trouble to find out what those whom they were talking about had really said. Many statements have been made, many jokes have been joked, many outcries have been raised, some ingenious names have been invented, nay, even some arguments have been brought, and all about doctrines which no man in this world ever held. Personally I have nothing more to say on the matter. I have had my say: any body that cares to know what that say is may read it for himself.¹ I will make only one remark on a single statement which I have casually lighted on, and which is, on the whole, the very strangest that I have ever seen. I find in a volume of a series which comes under the respectable name of "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge"—a series to which Oxford professors and examiners contribute, a book which has a book by Mr. Rhys before it and a book by Mr. Hunt after it—this amazing saying: "Florence uses the strange expression that Eadgar was chosen by the Anglo-Britons."² Strange indeed if Florence had ever used it; but to say that he did use it surely goes beyond the admitted literary and "stylistic" license of making people, old or new, say what they never did say. But the saying is instructive: it shows how some writers, sometimes more famous writers, now and then get at their facts. One received way is to glance at a page of an original writer, to have the eye caught by a word, to write down another word that looks a little like it, and to invent facts that suit the word written down. To roll two independent words into a compound word with a hyphen is perhaps a little stronger, but only a little. Florence says some thing about Englishmen in one line, and something about Britains in another line not far off. Roll them together: make a new fellow to Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Catholics, and we get the "strange expression," and the stranger fact, about Eadgar and the "Anglo-Britains." Yet even with a creator of "Anglo-Britons" we may make peace for the present.

¹ I must refer to what I have said on "Teutonic Conquest in Gaul and Britain" in "Four Oxford Lectures" (Macmillan, 1888), and to the essay on "Race and Language" in the third series of Historical Essays.

² Anglo-Saxon Britain, by Grant Allen, B.A., p. 147. The real words of Florence (959) are: "Rex Mercensium Eadgarus, ab omni Anglorum populo electus anno ætatis suæ 16, adventus veri Anglorum in Britanniam quingentesimo, 363 autem ex quo sanctus Augustinus et socii ejus in Angliam venerunt." No words could be more carefully chosen.

There is allowed to be something "Anglo" in the matter; and that for the present is enough. The old question was, after all, simply one of less and more. There was some "Anglo" something, only how much? He who shall say that the present English-speaking people of Britian are Angles and Saxons who have assimilated certain infusions, British and otherwise, and he who shall say that the English-speaking people of Britian are Iberians, Celts, Romans, any thing, who have received just enough of Anglian and Saxon infusion to be entitled to be called "Anglo Britons," maintain doctrines that differ a good deal from one another. Still it is only a difference in degree. Both sides may encamp together in the struggle with the new adversaries. Whether the Angle assimilated the Briton or the Briton assimilated the Angle, there was some "Anglo" element in the business. It is serious for both to be told that there never was any "Anglo" element at all; while, according to one view, there could hardly have been Briton enough to have the "Anglo" element, if there had been any, hyphenated on to him.

We have in this matter to deal with two writers, whom it may seem somewhat strange to group together. M. Du Chaillu has startled us, one may venture to say that he has amused us, by a doctrine that a good many tribes or nations which have hitherto gone about with tribal or national names had no right to any national names at all, but only to the name of an occupation. The Franks of the third century, the Saxons of the fifth, were not Franks or Saxons, but "Vikings." Being "Vikings," they may have been Suiones, Swedes, Danes, Norwegians: but the chief thing is to be "Vikings;" they belong to the "Viking age." On this teaching I shall say a few more words presently. I want just now to point out that, according to the Viking doctrine, we must have come from lands farther to the north than we have commonly thought. And this doctrine I wish to contrast with another, which has been less noticed than one might have expected, according to which we must have come from lands much farther to the south than we have commonly thought. Of these two doctrines, the first comes to this, that Angles and Saxons are all a mistake. There was no migration into Britian from the lands which we have been taught to look on as the older England and the older Saxony: the name of Angle and Saxon came somehow to be wrongly applied to people who were really Suiones or others entitled to be called Vikings. I am not sure that I should have thought this doctrine, at least as set forth by M. Du Chaillu, worthy of any serious examination, had it not been for the singular relation in which it stands to the other slightly older teaching, which, when we strive to obey the precept, "*Antiquam exquirite matrem*," bids us look, not farther to the north than usual, but farther to the south. According to this teaching, there may have been some Saxons from North Germany among the Teutonic settlers in Britian, but the main body came from a more southern land. These two doctrines, very opposite to one another, but both upsetting most things which we have hitherto believed, have been put forward in a singularly casual way. Some will perhaps be a little amazed when for the southern doctrine I send them to Mr. Seebohm's well-known book, "The English Village Community." There it certainly is: it is not exactly set forth by Mr. Seebohm, but it has at least dropped from him; and the opposite doctrine has not much more than dropped from M. Du Chaillu. Both teachings are thrown on the world in a strangely casual sort, as mere appendages to something held to be of greater moment. Still M. Du Chaillu does put forth his view as a view; Mr. Seebohm lets fall his pearls, if they be pearls, seemingly without knowing that they have fallen from him. I am not going to discuss any of Mr. Seebohm's special theories, about manors or serfdom, about one-field or three-field culture. Mr. Seebohm's views on these matters, whether we accept them or not, are, as the evident result of honest work at original materials, eminently entitled to be weighed, and, if need be, to be answered. And in any case we can at least give our best thanks to Mr. Seebohm for his maps and descriptions of the manor of Hitchin, a happy survival in our day of a state of

things which in most places has passed away. What I have to deal with now, as far as Mr. Seeböhm is concerned, is to be found in one or two passages in his book, in which, as I have hinted, he lets fall, in a perfectly casual way, doctrines which go far to upset all that has hitherto been held as to the early history of the English folk.

Now, a wholly new teaching on such a matter as the beginning of our national life in our present land is surely a matter of some importance. If it is true, it is a great discovery, entitled to be set forth as a great discovery, with the proudest possible flourish of trumpets. The new teaching should surely be set forth in the fullest and clearest shape, with the fullest statement of the evidence on which it rests. But with Mr. Seeböhm the new doctrine drops out quite suddenly and incidentally, as a point of detail which does not very much matter. The belief as to their own origin which the English of Britain have held ever since there had been Englishmen in Britain seems to Mr. Seeböhm not to agree with his doctrines about culture and tenures of land. It is by no means clear that there is any real contradiction between the two, but Mr. Seeböhm thinks that there is. He is so convinced of the certainty of his own theory, that the great facts of the world's history must give way if they cannot be reconciled with it. The strange thing is, that Mr. Seeböhm does not seem the least proud of his great discovery: he hardly seems to feel that he has made any discovery. He is less excited about a proposition which makes a complete revolution in English history than some are when they think that they have corrected a date by half an hour, or have proved some one's statement of a distance to be wrong by a furlong. All turns on the "one-field system" and the "three-field system." The three-field system existed in England, it existed in certain parts of Germany; but it did not exist in those parts of Germany which were inhabited by Angles and Saxons. Therefore, if Britain had any Teutonic settlers at all, they must have come from some other part and not from the land of the Angles and Saxons. Only, to judge from Mr. Seeböhm's tone, the question whence they came, or whether they came from anywhere, is a question hardly worth thinking about, compared with matters so much more weighty as the system of "one-field" or of "three."

Our first foreshadowing of what is coming is found at p. 372 of Mr. Seeböhm's book: "Now, possibly this one-field system, with its marling and peat-manure, may have been the system described by Pliny as prevalent in Belgic Britain and Gaul before the Roman conquest, but certainly it is not the system prevalent in England under Saxon rule. And yet this district where the one-field system is prevalent in Germany is precisely the district from which, according to the common theory, the Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain came. It is precisely the district of Germany where the three-field system is conspicuously absent. So that although Nasse and Waitz somewhat hastily suggested that the Saxons had introduced the three-field system into England, Hanssen, assuming that the invaders of England came from the north confidently denies that this was possible. The Anglo-Saxons and the Frisians and Low Germans and Jutes who came with them to England cannot (he writes) have brought the three-field system with them into England, because they did not themselves use it at home in North-west Germany and Jutland." He adds that even in later times the three-field system has never been able to obtain a firm footing in these coast districts."

It is wonderful indeed to find the origin of the English people thus dealt with as a small accident of questions about marling and peat manure. Hanssen confidently denies that the Angles and Saxons could have brought the three-field system into Britain from their old home; and, if it be true that the three-field system was never known in their older home, he assuredly does right confidently to deny it; only why should so much be made to turn on the different modes of culture followed

in the continental and the insular English land? If the one-field system suited the soil of the old Angeln and the old Saxony, while the three-field system better suited the soil of East Anglia or Sussex, surely our Angles and Saxons would have sense enough to follow in each land the system which suited that land. If they found that the kind of husbandry which suited the soil of their old home did not suit the soil of their new home, they would surely invent or adopt some other kind of husbandry which did suit it. But in any case, if the acceptance of a certain doctrine about the "one-field system with its marling and peat-manure" involves nothing short of all that Mr. Seeböhm assures us that it does involve, it would surely have been worth while to think about the marling and the peat-manure a second time by the light of what had hitherto been looked on as the broad fact of the history of England and Europe. These last may be wrong; but they are surely at least worthy of being thought over before they are cast aside. But with Mr. Seeböhm the "common theory" — that is, the recorded history of the English people — is not worth a thought: it may go anywhere. "Hanssen assumes that the invaders of England came from the north." That will do for the present: let them come from any land, so that it be not a land that practises "the one-field system with its marling and peat-manure."

Some way further on (p. 410) Mr. Seeböhm has another passage, in which, seemingly with the same words of Hanssen before him, he throws out, still very casually but not quite so casually as before, an exactly opposite doctrine: "We have already quoted the strong conclusion of Hanssen that the Anglo-Saxon invaders and their Frisian Low German and Jutish companions could not introduce into England a system to which they were not accustomed at home. It must be admitted that the conspicuous absence of the three-field system from the north of Germany does not, however, absolutely dispose of the possibility that the system was imported into England from those districts of middle Germany reaching from Westphalia to Thuringia where the system undoubtedly existed. *It is at least possible that the invaders of England may have proceeded from thence rather than, as commonly supposed, from the regions on the north coast.*"

It is hardly worth while to stop to comment at any length on the confusion of thought implied in such phrases as "Anglo-Saxon invaders of England." As there can be no *Anglia* till there are *Angli*, they would literally imply that a band of Angles first came into Britain by themselves, that they set up an England therein, and then sent to their hyphenated kinsfolk on the mainland to come after them to share, and doubtless to enlarge, that England. But of course what Mr. Seeböhm means by "invaders of England" are those who out of part of Britain made an England for certain later people to invade. We have got back to the days of our grandmothers, when our little books told us how Cæsar was "resisted by the English people, who were then called the Britons." We have perhaps got back to the days of good old Tillemont, who attributes all that was done on the native side during the Roman occupation of Britain to "les Anglois." The confusion, however, belongs to the German writer: Mr. Seeböhm simply copies him. And in one point, Mr. Seeböhm, after some striving with himself, has corrected a still stranger confusion of his guide. In his first edition the *Niedersachsen*, which Hanssen so oddly couples with *Angelsachsen* appear in one place as "Low-Germans," in another as "Low-Saxons." In a later revision the "Low-Saxons" have vanished.¹ But to couple "Low-German" (the whole) with Anglo-Saxons, Frisians, etc. (each of them parts of that whole) is, as a logical division, even stranger than to couple *Angelsachsen* and *Niedersachsen*. This last phrase implies "High-Saxons" somewhere; and it might not be an ill guess that they are the same as the

(Continued on p. 75.)

¹ The text of Hanssen, *Agrarhistorische Abhandlungen*, i. 496, stands thus: "Allein die Angelsachsen und die welche mit ihnen nach England gezogen sein mögen; Friesen, *Niedersachsen*, Juten, können die Dreifelderwirtschaft nicht nach England mitgebracht haben, weil sie in ihrer Heimat selber in nord-westlichen Deutschland und Jütland nicht betrieben hatten."

¹ In Mr. Seeböhm's first edition, the word in the second extract was "Low-Saxon;" in the third it is "Low-German." Hanssen's word is *Niedersachsen*. If he is thinking of the circle of *Niedersachsen* in later German geography, it does not at all help him.

THE LATEST THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH.

(Continued from p. 71.)

"Anglo-Saxon invaders of England," who came from somewhere in middle Germany. Only how is this doctrine to be reconciled with the "assumption" that "the invaders of England came from the north"? Taking it by itself, the southern theory comes to this: the main body of the invaders, "Anglo-Saxons," "High-Saxons," whatever they are to be called, started from middle Germany, from some point between Westfalia and Thuringia, from some part far away from marling and peat-manure; but on their road to Britain they fell in with certain companions, — Frisians, Low-Saxons, Jutes, — all seemingly from the marling and peat-manure country. In company with them, they came into Britain, to a part of it which had somehow already become "England."

This seemingly is the doctrine which is casually thrown out in the second of our quotation from Mr. Seebohm. Now, if we could only get rid of hyphenated words, and talk simply of "Angles" or "English," it would help Mr. Seebohm's case not a little. The odd thing is, that, in arguing against Mr. Seebohm's case, one has first to put together his case for him. In his casual way of putting things, he does not seem to know how much might have been really said on behalf of something very like the view which he lets fall. In the older edition of Spruner's "Atlas," Mr. Seebohm would have found an English land marked for him in the very part of Germany where he would have most wished for it. There was an *Angeln* shown clearly enough between Westfalia and Thuringia, and whatever was to be said about the branch of the Angles who were held to have dwelled there was carefully brought together by Zeuss.¹ Unluckily this inland *Angeln* has vanished from the revised Spruner-Menke, as also from the new atlas of Droysen. It might therefore be dangerous to build any theories on the subject without going deeply into the whole question; but just such an *Angeln* as suited Mr. Seebohm's theory was there, according to the best lights, at the time that Mr. Seebohm wrote. If he was not aware of this, his stumbling by an *a priori* road on a doctrine actually supported by such respectable authorities is one of the strangest of undesigned coincidences. If he was aware of it, it is almost more strange that he should not have thought it worth while to refer to a fact or supposed fact of so much value for his case. With its help, that case could be put in a very taking shape. These central Angles, used to a three-field system, set out to go somewhither, it need not have been to Britain. On the road they fall in with companions, Saxons, Low-Saxon, Frisian, Jutish, any thing else. These seafaring folk would doubtless know the way to Britain much better than the Angles of middle Germany. They suggest the course that the expedition should take, and the united force crosses the sea in as many keels as might be needful. It may even be, if anybody chooses, that the inland Anglos, entering into partnership with the seafaring Saxons, first set foot on British soil under the style, already duly hyphenated, of "Anglo-Saxons." To be sure, in Britain itself the compound name was not heard till some ages later, and then only in a very special and narrow sense. But on the mainland it was known much earlier. Paul the Deacon uses it;² it may have been used earlier still. So there is really a very fair case made out for "Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain" coming from Mid-Germany, and no doubt bringing the three-field system with them. We have only to suppose that in the matter of agriculture some such agreement was made between the different classes of settlers, as we know was sometimes made among joint settlers in early times. The Sicilian Naxos reckoned as a colony of Chalkis, but it took its name from the elder Naxos. In Himera, peopled by Dorians and Chalkidians, the speech was mingled, but the laws were Chalkidian. So in

the Anglo-Saxon colonization of Britain it was evidently agreed that the Angles should bring their system of three-field culture into the conquered land; the Saxons, Low-Saxons, Frisians, and Jutes, any other votaries of marling and peat-manure, had to conform to the practice of their betters.

There would still remain the question of language, — a point of which Mr. Seebohm does not seem to have thought, but on which Zeuss underwent some searchings of heart. He puts the question, without very positively settling it, whether Angles who dwelled so far south spoke High Dutch or Low. In the fifth century, indeed, the question could hardly have been of the same moment as it would have been in the ninth. The High Dutch has not as yet wholly parted company with the Low. Still the point is worth thinking of. Those who use the one-field and the peat-manure have ever belonged to the ranks of men who *eaten* and *drinken*. It may be that those who practise the three-field culture had already begun to fall off to them who *essen* and *trinken*. But one thing at least is certain: no man ever did *essen* and *trinken* in this isle of Britain. If, then, the Angles of the inland England had begun to adopt the more modern forms, something of an agreement — again like that of the Dorians and the Chalkidians — must have been come to between them and their Nether-Dutch companions. While the inland Angles had their way in the matter of three-field culture, the lesser point of language was yielded in favor of the seafaring Saxon.

Mr. Seebohm's casual theory, then, when worked out with some little care, really puts on so winning an air that it is hard not to accept it. Yet, even if we accept the existence of an inland *Angeln* without any doubt, Mr. Seebohm's theory at least would no thold water. It simply has against it the universal belief of Englishmen from the beginning. In the eyes of Baeda, in the eyes of the Chroniclers, in the eyes of the gleeman of Brunanburh, in the eyes of all who ever spoke or sang of the great migration of our people, the Angles, no less than the Saxons, count among the seafaring folk of northern Germany. The England from whence they came, the England which their coming was said to have left empty of men, was the England of the coast of Sleswick, not any inland England between Westfalia and Thuringia. At all events, if we are to believe otherwise, we have at least a right to ask that the question shall be thoroughly discussed on its own merits, and not tossed jauntily aside as a small point in the history of the rotation of crops. Till then, whether we believe that we were called "*ab angelica facie, id est pulcra*," or merely because we dwelled "*in angulo terræ*" we shall still go on believing that it was from the borderland of Germany and Denmark that our forefathers, set forth to work by sea their share in the wandering of the nations. It may be that some of the Anglian folk may well have strayed inland, as some of the Saxon folk may have strayed farther inland still. But the first England of history, the land from which men set forth to found the second, as from the second they set forth to found the third, was assuredly no inland region from which they had to make their way to a distant coast and there pick up Saxons or Frisians as companions of their further journey. The little England, the little "*angulus terræ*," of Sleswick was only part of it. There is no need minutely to measure how much was Anglian, how much Saxon, how much Frisian, how much belonged to any other branch of the common stock. In the days of Tacitus and Ptolemy the Angle and the Frisian were folk of the mainland only: by the days of Procopius they had won their home in the island to part of which one of them was to give his name.

We came by sea. By no other way indeed could we make our way into an island. But we came by sea in another sense from that in which Roman Cæsar came by sea before us and Norman William came after us. We came by sea not simply because the sea was the only road but because we came as folk of the sea to whom the sea was not a mere path but a true home. Of the details of the purely Anglian settlement and of the Angles themselves we know comparatively little, for the obvious reason that they lay farther off than their fellows from

¹ "Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme," 153, c.f. 495. It would be dangerous to enter casually and light-heartedly on questions about "Angrivarii," "Engern," and the like.

² Paul the Deacon speaks of "Angli-Saxones" (iv. 22, vi. 15) and "Saxones Angli" (v. 37). For other instances see Norman Conquest, i. 541.

the range of Roman knowledge. But of the Saxon shipmen and their doings we know a good deal: Sidonius has taken no small pains to show what manner of men they seemed to be in the eyes of the Roman of Gaul.¹ They first harried and then settled on both sides of the Channel. That their settlements in Britain were greater and more abiding than their settlements in Gaul was the result of many later causes. The Saxon of Chichester owes his presence on British ground to the same general effort to which the Saxon of Bayeux owed his presence on Gaulish ground. The Saxon of Chichester keeps his Saxon speech and from his land the Saxon name has not passed away. The Saxon of Bayeux has for ages spoken the Latin tongue of his neighbors, and while Sussex yet lives on the map, the *Otlingua Saxonica* has given way to other names to the *Bessin* and the department of *Calvados*. But each was planted in his new home by the force of the same movement, the Saxon wandering on the sea. And once planted in his new home, whether in the island or on the mainland, he ceased to be a wanderer by sea. He sat down and tilled the earth, and he guarded the earth which he tilled by the arms no longer of the seafarer but of the land warrior. The change is not wonderful. It has often happened in other lands, it has happened again in the same land. To be seafaring folk or to be landsmen is not always a question of what is born in the blood. Prosaic as it sounds, it is often the result of the circumstances in which men find themselves. Seafaring Corinth planted at one blow her twin colonies of Korkyra and Syracuse. Korkyra on her island met her parent on the seas with fleets equal to her own. Syracuse, planted in an island indeed, but an island that was in truth a continent, took to the ways of continents. Her landfolk were driven to take to the sea to meet the attacks of those Athenians who, two or three generations before, had been no less landfolk themselves.² So it was in the very land of Bayeux. When the Northmen came in their ships, neither Saxon nor Frank had ships to withstand them. Presently the seafaring Northmen, once settled in the land, changed into Norman landfolk, foremost of warriors with horse and lance, but to whom the horses of the wave had become simply means to carry them safe from Rhêgion to Messana, or from St. Valery to Pevensey.

Why, some one may ask, do I put forth again such very obvious truths as these? Because they are of no small importance, if we are to discuss the latest theory of all as to the origin of the English people. The only question is whether that theory need be discussed at all: it is hard to argue against that state of mind which, in the days when we learned logic, we used to call *ignoratio elenchi*. But if not discussed, it must be mentioned. Perhaps if this newest view of all had not come up the other day, I might not have chosen this time to talk about the views of Mr. Seebohm. But when M. Du Chaillu puts forth his theory, it at once recalls Mr. Seebohm's theory. The two stand in a certain relation to one another: neither can be fully taken in without the other. Both alike throw aside the recorded facts of history in the interest of a theory, be it a theory of the rotation of crops or a theory of the greatness of Vikings. Each theorist alike, possessed of a single thought, cannot be got to stop and think what there is to be said on the other side. M. Du Chaillu has put forth two very pretty volumes, with abundance of illustrations of Scandinavian objects. Most of them, to be sure, will be found in various Scandinavian books: still here they are, very many of them, and looking very pretty. M. Du Chaillu has given us a great many translations of sagas; but we have seen other translations of sagas, and some of them have been made by sound scholars. Criticism is hardly attempted. When the Scandinavian legend can be tested by the authentic English history, when the saga itself can be divided into the contemporary and trustworthy verse and the later and untrustworthy prose, — work, all this, which has been done over and over again by the scholar for more than one nation, — M. Du Chaillu simply gives us the sagas again, with comments now and then of amazing simplicity. The saga

of Harold Hardrada, the bits of genuine minstrelsy of the eleventh century patched together by the prose of the thirteenth, has been long ago thoroughly examined in its relations to the English narratives; above all, to the precious piece of contemporary English minstrelsy preserved by Henry of Huntingdon. It might have seemed hardly needful nowadays to prove once more that the picture of the English army in the saga is simply a fancy piece drawn from an English army of the thirteenth century. There are the English archers, the English horsemen, horsemen too whose horses are sheeted in armor. If any man doubts, he has nothing to do but to compare Snorro's fancy piece with the living representation of a real English army of the eleventh century in the contemporary tapestry of Bayeux. There he will see that to the English of that day the horse was simply a means to carry him to and from the place of battle, and that the clothing of horses in armor was a practice as yet unknown to the Norman horsemen themselves. Yet after all this, so often pointed out, M. Du Chaillu volunteers a little note to say that Snorro's version proves "that the English, like their kinsmen, had horses." That we had horses, no man save Procopius¹ ever doubted; but both Brihtnoth and Harold got down from their horses when the work of battle was to begin.

It is hardly by an adversary who cannot wield the weapons of criticism better than this that we shall be beaten out of the belief that there is such a thing as an English people in Britain. Perhaps, too, we shall not be the more inclined to give up our national being when we see its earliest records tossed aside with all the ignorant scorn of the eighteenth century. The "Frankish and English chroniclers" rank very low in the eyes of M. Du Chaillu. We know exactly where we have got when we come to the old conventional talk about "ignorant and bigoted men," "monkish scribes," and the like. Among these monkish scribes we have to reckon Einhard and Count Nithard, and our own literary ealdorman, Fabius Patricius Quæstor Ethelwardas. The odd thing is that, with M. Du Chaillu, Franks and Saxons or English go together. He is at least free from his countrymen's usual weakness of claiming the Franks, their kings, their acts, and their writings, for their own. As far as his theory can be made out, it seems to be this: the Suiones of Tacitus are the Swedes, and the Suiones had ships; so far no one need cavil. But we do not hear of the Suiones or any other Scandinavian people doing any thing by sea for several centuries. But, though we do not hear of it, they must have been doing something. What was it that they did? Now, in the fourth, fifth, sixth, centuries, we hear of the Saxons doing a good deal by sea: therefore the name "Saxones" must be a mistake of the Latin writers for "Suiones." It was not Saxons, but Swedes, or at least Scandinavians of some kind, who did all that is recorded of the Saxons, and presumably of the Angles and Jutes also, in Gaul, Britain, or anywhere else. The Angles and Saxons, therefore, who have been hitherto thought to have settled in Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries, are all a mistake. They were not Angles or Saxons at all, but Scandinavians of some kind. Hengest and Ælle were simply the advanced guard of Hubba, Sween, and Cnut. They could not have been Saxons, because, when the Northmen came against the continental Saxons of later times, they found no fleets to withstand them.

The assumption that goes through all this is, that once a seaman, ever a seaman; once a landsman, ever a landsman. These could not be seafaring Saxons in the fifth century, because we do not hear of Saxon fleets in the eighth. On the other hand, because the Suiones had ships in the days of Tacitus, as they could not have left off using ships, it must have been they who did the acts which are commonly attributed to the Saxons. A good deal is involved in this last assumption: it is at least conceivable, and not at all unlike the later history of Sweden, that the Suiones went on using their ships, but used them somewhere else, and not on the coast of Gaul or Britain. But of the grand assumption of all — the assumption that the landsman can never become a seaman or the seaman a

¹ The great description comes in the sixth letter of the seventh book.

² Thucydides, vii, 21.

¹ Bell. Gotth. iv. 20.

landsman—I have spoken already. And if this be a real difficulty, it is just as great a difficulty on M. Du Chaillu's theory as it is according to the genuine records of English history. Over and over again has it been noticed as a strange thing that the settlers who came to Britain by sea, as soon as they were settled in Britain, left off their seafaring ways, and had no fleet to withstand the Danes when the Danes did come. There is in this really nothing wonderful. But if this be a difficulty in the case of Anglian or Saxon settlers, it is hard to see how the difficulty becomes any less if the settlers are rated to be Swedish, Danish, or Norwegian.

In truth, M. Du Chaillu's theory is several degrees more amazing than that of Mr. Seebohm. How did we come by our language? How did we come by our national names? We did not, according to this theory, light by the way on any of those Low-Saxon, Frisian, or Jutish companions and teachers who, in Mr. Seebohm's view, may have done so much for us. And it is a little daring of M. Du Chaillu to represent the use of the Saxon name, as applied to the ravagers and settlers of Gaul and Britian, as simply the mistake of some Latin scribe, some ignorant blunderers like Claudian or Sidonius, who wrote "Saxones" when they should have written "Suiones." The mistake went a little deeper than that. How came the Teutonic settlers in Britain to call themselves Angles and Saxons? How did their Celtic neighbors come to call them Saxons? How did the conquered land come to take, here the Anglian, there the Saxon, name? One is astonished to read in M. Du Chaillu's book, "Nor is any part of England called *Saxland*."¹ It is possible from the context that what is meant is merely that no part of England is so called in the northern sagas. But the name of "England" comes often enough in them, and "England" is as bad as "Saxland" for M. Du Chaillu's theory. It is hardly worth searching through all the sagas to see whether such a word as "Saxland" is ever found there or not. If it be so, it merely proves that no northern writers had any need to speak of Wessex, Essex, Sussex, or Middlesex by their local names. But considering that those names have been in unbroken use in the lands themselves ever since the fifth and sixth centuries, it does not much matter whether any sagaman called them so or not. It is more important, from M. Du Chaillu's point of view, to explain how West-Saxons, East-Saxons, South-Saxons, and Midde-Saxons were led into such strange mistakes as to their own name and origin.

No one denies that the Scandinavian infusion in England is real, great, and valuable; only it is an infusion which dates from the ninth century, and not from the fifth or sixth. Danish writers, without going quite so far as their champion from Valland, have often greatly exaggerated the amount of Scandinavian influence in England. They have often set down as signs of direct Scandinavian influence things which are simply part of the common heritage of the Teutonic race. But no one doubts that the Danish infusion in England was large, that in some parts it was dominant; and its influence was wholesome and strengthening. Dane and Angle, Dane and Saxon, were near enough to each other to learn from one another, and to profit by one another. They were near enough to be fused into one whole by a much easier process than that which in some parts of the island did in the end fuse together the Briton and the Teuton. Still the Scandinavian infusion was but an infusion into the already existing English mass. As we are not a British people, but an English people with a certain British infusion, so neither are we a Scandinavian people, but an English people with a certain Scandinavian infusion.

One word about the Franks, whose fate at M. Du Chaillu's hands is so oddly the same as that of the Saxons. According to him, as some Suiones were mistaken for Saxons, which gave rise to the error of looking on Saxons as a seafaring people, so also some Suiones were mistaken for Franks, which gave rise to the error of looking on Franks as a seafaring people. But this last error, at all events, never led astray any one. The Franks were not a seafaring people, nor [did any body ever

think that they were. The whole notion of seafaring Franks comes from two passages of Eumenios and Zôsimos which record a single exploit of certain Frankish prisoners, who seized on some ships in the Euxine and amazed mankind by sailing about the Mediterranean, doing much damage in Sicily, and getting back to Francia by way of the Ocean. This single voyage, wonderful as it was, is not quite the same thing as the habitual harrying of the coasts of the Channel, and of the Ocean too, by Saxons in their own ships. And when Ammianus speaks of Franks and Saxons laying waste the Roman territory by land and sea, the obvious meaning surely is that the Franks did it by land, and the Saxons by sea. But all things about Franks are surely outdone by a single sentence of M. Du Chaillu, standing alone with all the honors of a separate paragraph.

"In the Bayeux tapestry, the followers of William the Conqueror were called Franci and they have always been recognized as coming from the north."

Further comment is needless. We decline to be brought from the north by M. Du Chaillu, even more strongly than we decline to be brought from the south by Mr. Seebohm: for Mr. Seebohm does leave some scrap of 'separate national being' to the "Anglo-Saxon invaders" from the English land of middle-Germany; M. Du Chaillu takes away our last shreds; we are mere impostors, Suiones falsely calling ourselves Saxones. But let us speculate what might happen if M. Du Chaillu's theory should ever fall into the hands of those statesmen and princes of the Church who seem to have lately taken in hand the nomenclature of that part of mankind whom plain men may think it enough to call the English folk.¹ The other day one eminent person enlarged of the glories of the "Anglo-Saxon race," while another enlarged instead on the glories of the "British race." A third claimed the right of free discussion for all "speakers of the British language." Let gallant little Wales look out: there would seem to be some corner in its twelve (or thirteen) counties in which free discussion is just now not allowed. New names often take. In my youth the "Anglo-Saxon race" was unheard of, and the "British race" dates, I believe, only from the speech of last week, from which I quote. Why should the Suiones, so long and so unfairly cheated of their honor, not have their day at last? Set forth with a good delivery, at the end of a fine rolling period, "the imperial instincts of the Suionic race" would be as likely to draw forth a cheer as other phrases whose amount of meaning is very much the same. When will men, statesmen above all, learn that names are facts; that words, as expressing things, are themselves things; that a confused nomenclature marks confusion of thought, failure to grasp the real nature of things and the points of likeness and unlikeness between one thing and another? Leaving, then, the Anglo-Saxon race and the British race and the Suionic race, and the instincts, imperial or otherwise, of any of them, this question of the origin of our people, this great and abiding dispute whether we are ourselves or somebody else, suggests one or two practical thoughts. Here I rule no point of present controversy; I only give some hints which may possibly help those who have to rule such points.

There is an English folk, and there is a British Crown. The English folk have homes: the British Crown has dominions. But the homes of the English folk and the dominions of the British Crown do not always mean the same thing. Here, by the border stream of the Angle and the Saxon, we are at once in one of the homes of the English folk and in one — and I dare to think the noblest and the greatest — of the dominions of the British Crown. If we pass to the banks of the Indus and Ganges, we are still within the dominions of the British Crown, but we cannot say that we are any longer among the homes of the English folk. Let us pass again to the banks of the Potomac and the Susquehanna: there we have gone out of

¹ See the speeches of the Earl of Rosebery, Cardinal Manning, and the Earl of Carnarvon in the Times of Nov. 16, 1889. The qualification needful in all such cases must of course be understood — "if the speakers really said what the reporters put into their mouths."

¹ "The Viking Age," vol. i, p. 20.

the dominions of the British Crown, but we have come back again to the English folk in one of their chiefest homes. These are but plain facts—plain as the sun at noonday. It is because they are so plain, that mankind, above all orators and statesmen, will not understand them. Once more, let a man's words set forth his thoughts, and let him shape his thoughts by the facts. That is all; but if this counsel of perfection be too hard, it may be better to declaim about the "Suionic race" than about the "Anglo-Saxon race." It will lead fewer people astray.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

ELECTRICAL NEWS.

EDINBURGH INTERNATIONAL ELECTRICAL EXHIBITION. — The executive council decided to finally close the list of applications for space on Jan. 15, when allotment was proceeded with. The French, Italian, and Austrian exhibits are expected to be specially fine, while India, China, and Japan will all be well represented in the department devoted to general industries. The railway machinery and appliances section promises well, several of the leading railway companies having agreed to exhibit; while among electrical exhibitors are Sir William Thomson, W. H. Preece, Edison, the general post-office, Edison-Swan, Laing, Wharton & Down, Anglo-American Brush, Paterson & Cooper, United Electrical Engineering, King, Brown & Co., Mavor & Coulson, Sir William Vavasour (Limited), Elmore Copper Depositing Company, Thomson-Houston Welding Company, Newell Engine Company, Robey & Co., Electric Traction Company, Ernest Scott & Co., Ronald Scott, Woodhouse & Rawson, Butler, Jobson & Co., W. T. Glover & Co., National Telephone Company, Consolidated Telephone Construction Company, Col. Gouraud, Gent & Co., Exchange Telegraph Company, Eastern Telegraph Company. The Decauville Company propose to show a narrow-gauge railway in operation, but worked by electricity in lieu of steam. The executive council have arranged with Immisch & Co. for a ten-minutes' service of electric launches on the Union Canal between Fountainbridge and the exhibition, which will afford the public a novel and interesting mode of conveyance, and will probably constitute the first example of electric navigation for general traffic. In addition to the British electrical contingent, about one hundred and fifty electrical exhibits are expected from France, where the government have officially recognized the exhibition, and considerable numbers from other foreign countries. The financial prospects of the exhibition are regarded by the finance committee as eminently satisfactory, as, owing to the much larger sums obtained for refreshment and other concessions above those received at the former Edinburgh Exhibition of 1886, it is considered that the whole cost of the buildings, grounds, and preparations will be defrayed without drawing on the admission receipts at all, whereas in 1886 no less than \$110,000 had to be made up out of admission receipts before any thing was available wherewith to meet working expenses.

FRANKFORT ELECTRO-TECHNICAL EXHIBITION. — It is proposed to hold at Frankfort-on-the-Main an international electro-technical exhibition from June 1 to Oct 31 of the present year. The exhibition will include all branches of the electrical science and industry, but as a rule only those exhibits will be admitted which show a decided improvement on those of the last special exhibitions at Munich in 1882 and Vienna in 1883. The exhibits will be divided into twelve great groups, commencing with motors for electro-technical purposes, and ending with electrical literature. Applications should be made before Jan. 15, and addressed to Mr. Leopold Sonnemann, editor of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Frankfort-on-the-Main.

MR. A. W. PEARSON, for many years city editor of the *Morning Bulletin*, Norwich, Conn., in addition to his regular work on the *Bulletin*, will edit the entomological department of *The Observer*, — a paper for all who love the out-door world. *The Observer* is published at Portland, Conn.

BOOK-REVIEWS.

Practical Marine Surveying. By HARRY PHELPS. New York, Wiley. 8°. \$2.50.

THE author of this work, who is an officer in the United States Navy, elucidates, in a simple and straightforward manner, all the points that usually arise in a marine survey, omitting no essential detail, and yet avoiding the confusion produced by a multiplicity of explanations such as are too often indulged in by writers who aim to be practical rather than theoretical. The instructions given in the book are practical in the true sense of the word; that is, they show the student how theories are utilized in actual practice.

This work was specially prepared for use at the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where the need of such a text-book had been felt for several years by officers engaged in teaching marine surveying. The author, having been engaged exclusively in surveying work for some six years previous to his assignment to duty at the Naval Academy, was requested by the head of the department of astronomy, navigation, and surveying, to prepare a text-book on the subject of marine surveying to take the place of the one then in use. This volume is the result, and it will without doubt prove valuable not only to students at the academy, but also to others pursuing the same line of study. The methods described and explained in the work have been used in actual practice, with few exceptions, and have been found to give satisfactory results.

The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Lieut-Commander Asa Walker, U. S. N., who specially prepared the chapter on projection; and to Wharton's "Hydrographic Surveying," whence he takes the method of platting angles by means of chords. The book contains numerous illustrations and diagrams, including two excellent photo-engravings of the sounding-machine on the United States steamer "Ranger," in the chapter on sounding with wire.

Practical Hints for the Teachers of Public Schools. By GEORGE HOWLAND. (International Education Series.) New York, Appleton. 16°.

THE several chapters of this work were originally a series of lectures delivered by the author as superintendent of schools in Chicago. They are, as their name indicates, of a purely practical character, with only incidental references to educational theories, and they have been prepared with the special object of assisting teachers in their every-day work. The chief fault of the book is its desultory character, there being little attempt at an orderly development of the thought; but it is animated by an excellent spirit, and conveys many hints and suggestions that can hardly fail to be useful to bright and progressive teachers. Mr. Howland, we are glad to note, is not so excessively fond of mere method and professional training as some enthusiasts are, but insists more on the character of the teacher and the spirit with which she pursues her work. He remarks that "methods are not for their own sake—they are but means to an end;" and, again, that "the purpose of the public school, as seen in its origin and history, is intellectual culture, and those methods only can have a strong and lasting hold on the public mind which best promote this." He has some interesting remarks on school government and discipline, as to which he leans toward leniency rather than severity. He discusses the question of moral instruction in the public schools, which has been so much talked of lately, and shows very clearly that the schools exert a powerful influence on the character and conduct of the pupils, apart from any specific moral instruction. Indeed he speaks slightly of such instruction, when given in a formal manner, and maintains that morals are best taught by the example of the teacher, the requirements of the lessons, and the social life of the school. Besides these more general topics, Mr. Howland touches on a multitude of points in teaching and school management, showing a thorough knowledge of his subject and a lively interest in it. His book is one that teachers especially will like to read.